



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Morris has a more recent and much more accurate print of the manuscript in the *Old English Miscellany* (E.E.T.S., 49). An inspection of the latter would have enabled the editor to avoid the errors in footnotes 12, 13, 19, p. 318; 16, p. 319; 21, p. 320.

THOMAS A. KNOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit; Euphues & his England. By JOHN LYLY. Edited by MORRIS W. CROLL and HARRY CLEMONS. London: George Routledge & Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1916. Pp. lxiv+473.

Professor Croll in his new edition of *Euphues*—with a modernized text prepared largely by Mr. Clemons—succeeds through the introduction and notes in throwing fresh light on this much-studied pioneer work of the English Renaissance. In the notes many new sources and influences, especially of English proverbial lore, are traced for particular passages. In the introduction adequate attention is for the first time called to the influence exerted on the Euphuistic type of style by mediaeval rhetoric with its *schemata*, and thus an excellent corrective is furnished to previous studies, which have recently focused attention too exclusively on the contribution of humanism to Euphuism. Such a treatment lays the basis for a better understanding of the fact that Lyly, like Spenser, contributed to the outburst of creative literature in England by aiding in the amalgamation of mediaeval culture with the newly revived classical culture, and particularly by following in the wake of Italy, where already the amalgamation had produced a literature in harmony with the social life of the period. I have urged elsewhere that Lyly's plays show a modification of court-of-love allegory by Platonism and of mediaeval pageantry by a new romantic classicism, and that even the didactic *Anatomy of Wit* is typical of the combined influences at work in the writings of Lyly (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVII, 147–52; *Mod. Phil.*, XIV, 483–84). Professor Croll here emphasizes sufficiently the mediaevalism in the style of *Euphues*. But his emphasis of this tends to obscure the fact that the mediaeval tradition was practically absorbed in the new humanism. In drawing an unwarrantably sharp distinction between mediaeval and humanistic ideals of rhetoric, he neglects to point out how often a leading humanist like Erasmus overemphasizes rhetoric and recommends the more famous mediaeval rhetorics for study. In stressing the hostility of the humanists to the *schemata*, he does not trace the various degrees of purism among the men influenced by the New Learning or point out that his best exemplar, Wilson, belonged to a group of admirers of the simplicity of Demosthenes' style. In citing Ascham, another of this group, Professor

Croll has to admit that in certain types of work Ascham uses an ornate style; but even then he fails to realize that, guided by the contemporary laws of decorum, one must seek the immediate models for the style of Lyly's social romance in the non-didactic literature of the age. His mistake arises from accepting with Feuillerat *The Anatomy of Wit* as belonging, on account of its didacticism, with the works of Ascham and others of the puristic school, though he correctly traces the kinship of Lyly's style to that of other courtly writers (Puttenham furnishes an excellent uncited example of the long hold of mediaeval rhetoric on the court group). Professor Croll's conception of the nature of *The Anatomy* also leads him to overemphasize the influence of Ascham on the educational ideals of Lyly without showing how near Lyly is to the ideals of the Italian courtesy books in his treatment of social life, wit, etc. To Ascham he traces also the "bourgeois" spirit of *Euphues*, but he neglects the general humanistic conception of "gentility" most often discussed by the courtesy books. A somewhat similar lack of perspective seems to me to be shown in the emphasis on proverbs, which, like the maxims of "Cato" and similes from bestiaries, are simply one form of "amplification" by "precept and example" and an even less significant one than examples from Pliny's natural history or classical "sentences" and illustrations.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO